

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the plumb plate extends substantially parallel to the substantially vertical side surface of the main body. Claim 12 has been amended to recite that an upper edge of the plate member is oriented at substantially the same level as the lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body, and is substantially parallel to the lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body. Furthermore, the term “specific distance” in claim 12 has been changed to “predetermined distance.” Basis for these amendments is believed to be evident from the figures.

Claims 1-4, 12, 14-16, and 26-31 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Jackson. It is respectfully submitted that the amended claims define over this reference.

Jackson discloses a conventional motor boat 10 having a hull 11 and a bow 12, and a flat, substantially planar stabilizer fin 13 adapted for attachment to bow 12. A fin support strut 15 is fixedly secured to the trailing edge of fin 13, and extends upwardly at an angle from the trailing edge of stabilizer fin 13 and seats against hull 11. The fin 13 is secured in alignment with the longitudinal axis of the boat, although it can be provided at a location other than at the bow, such as along the keel and mounted within the hull.

Applicants had previously traversed the rejection based on Jackson, noting that the hull 11 at the location where strut 15 contacts therewith is not a substantially vertical side surface of the boat 10, and is at an angle that is closer to horizontal than vertical. In response,

paragraph 4 of the Office Action has noted that the claims did not require that the floating body be substantially vertical at the point of contact.

Claim 1 recites “a plumb plate is provided on at least a substantially vertical side surface of a floating main body”. In Jackson, the fin 13 is provided on the inclined surface of the hull 11. That is, the surface on which the fin 13 is provided is not a substantially vertical side surface of the hull 11.

Claim 1 now recites “a plumb plate extends substantially parallel to the substantially vertical side surface of the main body”. In Jackson, the fin 13 does not extend substantially parallel to the surface of the hull 11 on which the fin 13 is provided (see following reference 1).

Claim 1 recites “a plumb plate extends below a lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body.” The motor boat 10 of Jackson does not have the features “the fin 13 is provided on at least a substantially vertical side surface of the hull 11” and “fin 13 extends below a lowermost bottom surface of the hull 11”. Therefore, Claim 1 defines over Jackson.

Claim 12 has the feature “a plate member provided on a substantially vertical side surface of a floating main body.” In Jackson, as mentioned above, the fin 13 is not provided on a substantially vertical side surface of the hull 11.

Claim 12 has the feature “an upper edge of the plate member is oriented at substantially a same level as a lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body.” In Jackson, the fin 13 rotates about the hinge 16 (see FIGS. 1 and 3). According to FIG. 3, the upper edge of the fin 13 is clearly not oriented at substantially a same level as a lowermost bottom surface of the hull 11. Furthermore, in Jackson, as shown in FIG. 1 (see following reference 2), the upper edge of the fin 13 is clearly positioned above the lowermost bottom

surface of the hull 11. Therefore, it is clear that the upper edge of the fin 13 is not oriented at substantially a same level as a lowermost bottom surface of the hull 11.

Claim 12 now has the feature “the upper edge of the plate member is provided so as to be substantially parallel to the lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body.” In Jackson, neither FIG. 1 nor FIG. 3 discloses that the upper edge of the fin 13 is provided so as to be substantially parallel to the lowermost bottom surface of the hull 11 (see following reference 3).

In Jackson, since the fin 13 rotates about the hinge 16, the distance between the upper edge of the fin 13 and the hull 11 changes (see FIGS. 1 and 3). In Jackson, there is no description of the distance between the upper edge of the fin 13 and the hull 11. Moreover, it is not clear which distance in the figures is the distance between the fin 13 and the hull 11 since the upper edge of the fin 13 is not parallel to the lowermost bottom surface of the hull 11. That is, Jackson does not teach the distance between the fin 13 and the hull 11 at all. Therefore, Jackson does not disclose nor suggest that “the plate member has an edge section closest to the floating main body *that is separated from the floating main body by a predetermined distance*” and that “the upper edge of the plate member is provided so as to be substantially parallel to the lowermost bottom surface of the floating main body *via the predetermined distance*. ” Therefore, Claim 12 also defines over Jackson.

Application Serial No.: 10/669,682
Reply to Office Action dated November 19, 2007


Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicits an early Notice of Allowability.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Grégory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record

(Reference 1)



(Reference 2)

